DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 699 SP 028 485

AUTHOR Mahlios, Marc; And Others
TITLE Master Teacher Model Development Program.
PUB DATE Feb 87
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Arlington, VA, February 12-15, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Differentiated Staffs; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; *Master Teachers; Professional Recognition; *Program Development
IDENTIFIERS *Master Teacher Model Training Program

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of the Master Teacher Model Training Program was to develop models of university-school collaboration aimed at preparing outstanding inservice teachers in career ladder or similar career structure plans with the knowledge and skills needed to assume new educational responsibilities. The program answered a need to enhance such teachers' skill development and knowledge base for new roles such as supervisors, curriculum developers, and inservice trainers. This paper presents descriptions of the progress of the Program in three institutions--the University of Northern Iowa, Ball State University, and Illinois State University. The descriptions center on three major core components of the model: (1) the planning stage, during which each university worked closely with selected school systems, defining their needs and designing instruction to be delivered in meeting those needs; (2) an intensive training stage, involving university delivery of instructional assistance to meet identified school system needs; and (3) a technical assistance stage, involving participating university personnel in follow-up visitations to the school systems to provide on-site assistance and advice to the personnel having received training. The primary effort was to help school systems meet their needs through working with master or outstanding teachers who would be involved in educational reform efforts in their systems. The teachers selected continued as classroom teachers, but were given released time and/or additional compensation to serve as resource persons trained to assume additional responsibilities within their school systems. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277699

Master Teacher Model Development Program

Marc Mahlios

Charles Moore

University of Northern Iowa

Donald Barnes

Harry Bell

Ball State University

Donald Kachur

Norm Bettis

Illinois State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Moore

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A paper presented to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Annual Meeting, Washington, D. C., February, 1987.

SP 028 485

Abstract

This paper presents a three state project involving Illinois State University, University of Northern Iowa, and Ball State University that was funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE). The project focused on three innovative preparation programs for master teacher development. The presentation will introduce the unique programs conducted, their outcomes and implications for further development of such programs at the school district level.

Master Teacher Model Development Program

American education's experience with 'master teacher' concepts, policy and practicies is not a phenomena of the 1980's. Within this century alone literally hundreds of papers (Freiberg, 1985) have offered definitions and models for implementing staffing structures that would allow for career steps in what traditionally has been characterized as an 'unstepped career line' (Lortie, 1975). There are, and have been, numerous rationales in support of career structure differentiation. Among the more frequently cited rationales include: Minimizing attrition among most productive teachers (Schlecty and Vance, 1983); enhancing opportunities for career development (Chapman and Hutcheson, 1982); sensitizing the reward structure to differences in teacher skills, ability and discipline (Carroll, 1974); relief from stress and job dissatisfaction (Oxman and Michelli, 1980); incentives associated with increased productivity (Macarov, 1982; Price, 1977; Lortie, 1975; Herzberg, 1966); motivation to work (Sergiovanni and Carver, 1980); job enrichment (Hackman and Oldham, 1980); leadership density (Sergiovanni, 1985; Lipsitz, 1984) and leadership collaboration (Little, Long, and Guilkey-Amado, 1986; Hord, Huling and Stiegelbauer, 1983). More recently, however, compelling arguments have been advanced in the form of sociological concepts that have been found to undergird all of the major professions and is one that we believe is evident in the current professional education interest in the master teacher concept and prior career staging models. Sociological analyses advance the view of a sociostructural transformation along a minor (e.g., teaching and social work) to major (medicine and law) professional continuum. In short, the socially accepted and preferred model for the major professions is inexorably moving toward a 'standard' design, a major tenet of which is a staged and

structured staffing scheme that includes, at a minimum, low, middle and high status professional steps within an inclusive personnel model.

Freidson (1972), for example, in his analysis of medicine as a major profession concludes that the social structure underlying the organization of professional performance is central to the notion of the professions. Drawing on the work of Hughes (1958), Freidson argues that a distinction can be made between occupations and the 'true' professions on the basis of their relative position within the social structure, i.e., the profession as organization theory, According to Freidson, (1972, p. 187):

> This is what is unique and central to the notion of profession (i.e., social structure). The professions's position in society does not necessarily (though it may) reflect a distinctively and especially superior skill, theoretical learning, or ethical behavior on the part of all or most members of the occupation. There are always occupations with such characteristics that are not granted the status of profession, and there are occupations granted the status which lack such characteristics. What the status reflects is society's belief that the occupation has such attributes and society's belief in the dignity and importance of its work. The conformity of the real characteristics of an occupation with all the beliefs about them is not presumed by my emphasis and is a matter for empirical determination. The emphasis of the definition <u>is</u> the status.

In short once we work from the assumption that the 'true' or major professions is defined principally as a special status in the larger division of labor within the society's social structure we can avoid the inherently etheriel arguments about what constitutes the professions. One clear marker, then, of a profession is whether, among other characteristics (cf Etzioni, 1969), is that it has ultimate control over its own work.

Occupations by definition, are thus subordinated to the professions and its workers. Thus for teaching to be socially held as a major profession it must hold a distinct place within the division of labor in the American social structure and be in the ultimate control of its work (i.e., standards, ethics, performance, regulation, and so on).

Clearly one way to promote teaching as a profession is to alter the career

structure of teaching based upon the necessary sociological conditions described above. There is ample reason (based upon the research literature on the professions) to see such a career structuring as essential to improved quality of teaching, as well as enhanced teacher commitment to teaching as a life long career (a characteristic frequently held to be foundational to any major profession). Ironically, we must also provide easier (and quicker) access to low and middle status positions in teaching for intellectually able adults who we have reason to believe will invest relatively short term career phases in teaching. In the past educators have typically envisioned a unidimensional career model and thus education has been weakened by large teacher turnovers. There is no inherent reason why we should be unable to create personnel models which would in fact profit from the predictable turnover of short term novice teachers. Similarly we have been largely unable to counteract role definitions that encourage capable classroom practitioners from leaving their classrooms for administrative positions. In short, we believe that essential to enhancing the attraction and retentive powers of teaching, its effectiveness, and the needed social recognition rests on a differentiated teaching force that can respond to the requirements and opportunities of a staged career line and one that is responsive to individual professional responsibilities and levels of autonomy. Differentiating the career structure of teaching would also allow us to keep highly accomplished practitioners at the center of their work - teaching. As is well documented, the conventional model seemingly forces teachers at the height of their clinical mastery to abandon classroom teaching for other school responsibilities. This is a phenomenon almost unknown in any of the major professions - yet is a frequently noted characteristic of the semi-professions (e.g., teaching, and social work). It increasingly appears that occupational mobility and choice of professional responsibilities is essential to career

satisfaction and consequently worker retention, development, and performance.

It can be argued that the apparent teacher shortage currently developing in the United States could be eased by staffing differentiation. The history of previous shortage periods shows that standards were lowered (or circumented through various emergency certificate programs) to allow unqualified persons to teach. Conversely a differentiated staffing model would allow for the maintenance of high standards by providing formal recognition of differing levels of professional status (a characteristic of the other major professions). In short a fully developed differentiated staffing model would accommodate for a supply and demand dynamic while maintaining high levels of professional integrity. This position stands in sharp contrast to the U.S. Department of Education's current support for certificating professionally unprepared persons. As we have learned from the established professions (e.g., law) differentiated staffing also allows for appropriate limiting of work autonomy. Under such an arrangement in education novice teachers would have markedly fewer professional prerogatives while the master teacher or career professional would enjoy a fuller array of choices in the conduct of their work. Credentials would be differentially awarded and recognized and provide a rationale for assigning teachers to status levels and appropriate work assignments.

It can also be argued that much of what we learned over the past two decades about effective teaching (for example, designs for individualizing instruction) can be best implemented through a staffing structure that allows for the utilization of differential skills based upon a structured career line for practitioners.

Finally the current efforts to establish professional graduate schools of education, as described in the Holmes and Carnegie reports, will be strengthened if career opportunities reward differential preparation. As

stated in the Holmes report (1986, p. 40):

> Finally, since we understand the reciprocal relationship between teaching and teacher education, differentiating the career would enhance professional schools of education. Just as the knowledge, skills, and sense of professional responsibility developed in teacher education programs affect the behavior of teachers, the working conditions and career structure of teaching influence the standards, structure, and content of teacher education. Improved teacher education must accompany and be accompanied by changes in the role, function, and nature of teaching. Both schools and universities must attact the problems of teacher education and teaching simultaneously. To create a market for professionally trained teachers with advanced graduate credentials, it is essential to provide expanded career opportunities and rewards in teaching. Otherwise prospective teachers will have few incentives to invest in the demanding professional education essential to competent teaching.

As efforts to improve teacher preparation advance, there must be available to graduates differentiated professional roles to reward the varying levels of credentials of applicants. It will be difficult to sustain more vigorous preparation initiatives if there are insufficient positions for professional teachers to assume. Indeed it is questionable whether preparation and school reform efforts can be sustained at all if appropriate career opportunities are unavailable to reward better prepared graduates. This represents an obvious dilemma in need of careful attention from the profession.

Program Overview

FIPSE Project

Schools across the country have found themselves heavily enmeshed in efforts to respond to educational reform. In addition to curricular and instructional changes, many public school systems have undertaken organizational changes such as creating career ladder or similar plans to enhance the teaching profession and promote school improvement activities through career differentiation. These efforts have included providing classroom teachers opportunities to assume new educational responsibilities in addition to classroom teaching. Those responsibilities have involved outstanding and experienced teachers working with less experienced teachers; serving as model teachers; conducting peer evaluations; undertaking research in their respective subject fields; planning staff development activities; and developing curricular and instructional materials.

The trends in educational reform and school efforts as well as teacher education reform proposals have resulted in the need for new and expanded forms of collaboration between schools and universities. It was the cooperative decision of three institutions in the Midwest (Illinois State University, ISU), Ball State University, BSU) in Indiana, and (University of Northern Iowa, UNI), the largest and most prestigious universities in their respective states for teacher preparation, to embark on a new form of collaboration with school systems. The effort became known as the Master Teacher Model Training Program. The primary purpose of this program was to develop models of university-school collaboration aimed at preparing outstanding inservice teachers in career ladder or similar career structure plans with the knowledge and skills needed to assume new educational responsibilities. The rationale behind this model program was that many of the tasks which teachers would find themselves

involved in outside of classroom instruction as a result of educational reform would be new challenges. For many of these teachers, they have not been prepared to assume new roles as supervisors, curriculum developers, inservice trainers, and the like. Therefore, it was assumed that there would be a need to enhance such teachers' skill development and knowledge base through targeted, job-specific training.

The specific objectives of the Model program were to: 1) undertake thorough and extensive planning of the nature, content, and delivery of training based on individual school district and participant needs; 2) achieve maxiumum learner impact as illustrated by graduate-level quality training which would be job-related and job-embedded; 3) pilot a university-school model of inservice training which could be institutionalized within the teacher education offerings of each university; 4) prepare a cadre of outstanding master teachers whose services might be contracted for involvement in the preservice and inservice programs of the universities teacher education programs; and 5) prepare a cohort of teachers within districts with knowledge and skills which they in turn can train others (trainer of trainers concept).

This model of university-school collaboration called for three major core components--a Planning Stage during which each university worked closely with selected school systems in helping them clearly define their personnel needs and designing the instruction to be delivered in meeting those needs; an intensive Training Stage involving university delivery of instructional assistance to meet identified school system needs; and a Technical Assistance Stage involving participating university personnel in follow-up visitations to the school system to provide on-site assistance and advice to the personnel having received training.

It was during the fall of 1984 when representatives of all three higher education institutions (ISU, BSU, and UNI) joined together in a mutual effort

to discuss possible collaborative endeavors as institutional responses to the educational reform movement affecting public schools. It was then that a concept paper was developed which became the framework for seeking and subsequently receiving Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) funding to pilot a proposed model of university/school collaboration. Each institution selected two school systems within their state for the first year of the project (a maximum of six teachers from each system). The intent was for each university to work individually with each school system, helping them identify their programmatic, organizational and/or instructional needs and to assist those systems in addressing those educational reform needs. Primary effort was to help school systems meet their needs through working with master or outstanding teachers who would be involved in educational reform efforts within their systems. This effort was not designed to convert classroom teachers into school administrators. Persons selected for this project were all to continue as classroom teachers in a major portion of their school assignments. However, those teachers selected were to be given released time and/or additional compensation to serve as resource persons trained to assume additional responsibilities within their school systems.

Planning Stage -- During the initial project year, a planning committee was established at each school site composed of university project personnel, administrators and teachers from the cooperating school systems. All planning committees met on a regularly scheduled basis for the purposes of identifying: 1) the needs of the school district; 2) nature of responsibilities to be assumed by teachers to be trained; 3) nature, content, and delivery strategies of the respective training; 4) logistics of the training program (e.g., location, time, days, duration); and 5) design and implementation of the university technical assistance to be provided to trainees when they assumed their new responsibilities.

The planning committee at each school site was under the direction of the two faculty from each university. The planning stage was seen as the most essential component and underlying foundation to the success of the model of collaboration developed within the entire project. Initially, planning committees were composed of university personnel and school system administrators. However, teacher involvement on the planning committees came about once those teachers were identified for the project. The involvement on the planning committees of those ultimately to receive training was regarded as valuable input to the development of activities which were to become part of the training component. Through the planning, the instructional content and modes for delivery were designed--all of which were based on what each participating school system identified as being realistic, job-related, most important and immediately useful. In short, the planning stemmed largely from the input of the participants or learners in the project.

Training Stage -- Based on the events and activities identified during the planning stage, training programs were established at each site involving teachers selected by their respective school systems. The topics for training and development were selected from the committee proceedings at the planning stage. Training varied at each site based on the identified needs of the participants and the schedules collaboratively agreed upon between systems and the related university. Training activities involved active participation of the teachers (learners) in the planning and conduct of learning experiences. University instructors used problem-centered approaches and drew upon participants to draw on their own knowledge and experiences in the study and analysis of given problems. Experiential learning opportunities were the driving force behind the training. Learner involvement, relevancy of examples and problems discussed and studied, learners developing a sense of responsibility for their own learning, and a learning environment which was

flexible and responsive to the learner's needs marked the features of training implemented at each of the sites.

The two school systems working in conjunction with the University of Northern Iowa studied the approporite roles and responsibilities for the development of teacher leadership. Both school systems in Iowa worked together with UNI on this same project activity. Studied and discussed were teacher leadership programs in other states and the development of means for increasing teacher leadership within the respective school system involved with the project.

The two school systems working with Illinois State University selected projects different from one another. One school system identified the need for helping teachers who assumed roles as team leaders to gain increasing skill in the area of communication. The other system called for help in developing an orientation program, program handbook, and evaluation of its newly developed Mentor Program. This was a program through which outstanding classroom teachers in this high school district were identified and selected for helping new teachers acclimate to the school system.

Ball State University assisted one school system through the project in revising its kindergarten program to better accommodate the individual needs of childen. In its other school system, BSU project staff helped school teachers to address the effective use of Prime Time aides (teacher aides) working in the primary grades.

Technical Assistance -- The time period for this stage of the model occurred prior to the planning and training stage year. This stage represented the beginning institutionalization and continuation of the training model by the universities as part of their program offerings. During this stage, university personnel visited those school systems and participating teachers who were involved in the training. These visits were provided on a regularly

scheduled basis for an agreed upon time period between each university and school system. This stage included the feedback and application of the elements learned during the training stage.

The primary organizational policy which had to be changed in order to undertake this project was a movement away from requiring credit generated coursework as part of the project. The effort undertaken was to deliver the kind of training required by school systems to meet their individual needs. Predetermined coursework along with its accompanying requirements in terms of the frequency and duration of meeting times, location, course requirements/assignments, and student evaluations were not seenas affording the flexibility envisioned for this project. Training to be provided had to be flexible in terms of content, delivery, and logistics in order to best meet the individual needs of each school system.

In addition, faculty assignments had to be made in a way that credit hours taught or generated were not the measure of a faculty member's workload. Rather, faculty time taken in meeting with school systems through planning committees, designing new curricula tailored to meet an individual school system's needs, delivering instruction which more often than not was non-credit bearing, and visiting teachers on-site for the purposes of observing and providing technical assistance, all had to be considered as part of each faculty member's workload.

Ball State University

Project Description

Two public school systems in Indiana worked cooperatively with Ball State University in developing and carrying out an aspect of the FIPSE grant. Under the original proposal the school systems were to identify areas of need and the university was to assist in addressing those needs.

The Anderson Project

Purpose of the Study

An in-depth assessment of the work of Prime Time aides was initiated in February, 1986. (These instructional assistants have been added to primary classrooms in Indiana in an effort to improve and extend learning opportunities at this level.) The specific aim of the investigation was to provide a minute by minute time and frequency profile of the activities of Prime Time aides from the beginning of each school day until children were dismissed at the close of the school session. Kindergarten, first grade and second grade instructional aides participated in the study over an eight week period. The Prime Time program has been in effect in Indiana for two years but there has been little attention given to the evaluation of its effects.

Initiating the Study

There were several major tasks that had to be completed before data could be collected. Participating teachers and schools had to be identified and an observational instrument had to be constructed that would allow data collectors to code information in an accurate and systematic manner. Data needed to be both reliable and valid. This concern for precise information led to the

formulation of low inference items (easily observed, overt teacher aid behaviors that could be quantitatively recorded and summarized - as opposed to the collection of impressionistic or anecdotal coding activities which often attempt to identify the affective dimensions of classroom climates as well as the intentions or motivations of subjects.) Data collectors had to be recruited and trained. Interviews were conducted and six applicants were selected. These people were trained in the use of the observational scale over a one week period. After each item on the scale was described and illustrated with pictures of aides engaged in learning activities, the data collectors were assigned in groups of two or three to participating classrooms. This provided an index of observer agreement and helped data collectors see the relationship between items on the observational scale and on-going instructional activities. During this experimental period several new items were added. These teacher aid behaviors had been overlooked previously. In addition to the collection and analysis of data in the main study, materials were prepared for use in summer workshops. Two types of materials were developed during the Spring semester:

a. Three slide programs were pictured and narration describing the multiple roles of Prime Time aides were prepared.

b. Print materials, including a summary of the activities of teacher aides in the 8-week study, were also developed.

During the summer of 1986 sixteen workshops were held at colleges and universities throughout the state. Teams of elementary principals and Prime Time teachers attended the one-week workshops. The Anderson teachers who assisted with the 8-week study served as leaders in the regional workshops.

Collection of Data

The collection of data went surprisingly well. The data collectors felt welcome in the participating classrooms, and it appeared that their presence

did not detract from learning activities. There was excellent coordination between classroom teachers and their aides. This made it possible for aides to be active and productive a great majority of the time. Some data collectors expected to find that students had become overly dependent on adult assistance, but this was not apparent. In addition, the observational scale proved to be highly functional.

Findings

Even a cursory glance at the figures compiled by the data collectors in this investigation clearly confirm the fact that aides assist powerfully in primary classrooms. Some findings:

a. During this brief 8-week period, it was found that aides assisted individual students a total of 8,123 times. This means that during the 138 full-day collecting sessions primary pupils were assisted more than an average of 58 times per day. (Data collecting was normally conducted three days a week in six classrooms. Complete data may be secured by writing to D. L. Barnes at Ball State university, Muncie, Indiana.)

b. Aides served throughout the day in a great many activities. When these individual periods of time were tabulated, it was found that aides assisted with learning programs a total of 39,258 minutes. This represents approximately 654 hours of assistance. It is probably safe to assume that, since the regular teacher was busy with other tasks during these instructional periods, the great majority of the jobs completed by the aides would have been left undone if they had not been assigned to these classrooms.

Richmond Project

Purpose of the Project

Two planning meetings were held with Richmond school administrators during the months of September and October, 1985 to consider several projects of high priority to leaders within the Richmond Community Schools. After several alternatives were considered, a decision was made to revise the kindergarten curriculum in all Richmond elementary schools with the primary goal of providing an exemplary kindergarten program designed to accommodate the

individual needs of each child. A second goal was to improve communication among teachers, parents, and school officials and to give parents a better understanding of the purpose of the Richmond kindergarten program.

Development of the Project

A team of eight educators, henceforth referred to as the Kindergarten Curriculum Study Committee, was organized to make plans for the project. The team included three Richmond kindergarten teachers, one elementary principal, the Richmond Early Prevention Coordinator, the Richmond Elementary Supervisor, one parent, and one professor from Ball State University. This team met in January and February, 1986, and decided on three primary thrusts for the project. First, a series of meeting would be held to evaluate the current kindergarten program in Richmond, with the goal of redesigning the program and activities within the kindergarten curriculum to better accommodate the individual needs of each kindergarten student. Second, a parent booklet would be developed for dessemination to all parents of kindergarten students. Finally, it was decided that a video tape depicting the various components of the Richmond kindergarten program would be developed to help interpret the kindergarten program to parents and interested members of the Richmond community.

The new, kindergarten program emphasizing individualized learning experiences was developed between February and July, primarily through a series of meetings offered by members of the Kindergarten Project Committee. Participating teachers attended five half-day inservice sessions for the purpose of designing the new kindergarten curriculum. Following each meeting, members were given assignments and tasks in preparation for the next current literature on kindergarten goals as well as an assessment of curriculum guides and courses of study from other school systems.

A half-day workshop was held in April. At his meeting a college specialist provided assistance and made suggestions regarding the revised courses of study. By June, a completely new kindergarten curriculum was completed and ready for implementation in the Autumn of 1986. A supplementary grant was secured to underwrite the cost of developing a video tape depicting kindergartens using the new curriculum.

Specific Outcomes of the Anderson and Richmond Projects

I. Project Outcomes:

A. The major goal of the Anderson project was to study, assess and describe the effectiveness of Prime Time aides at two schools within the Anderson School System.

B. Secondly, a grant from the Indiana Department of Public Instruction permitted the development of three audiovisual program describing the need for teacher aides, the work of teacher aides, and effective ways aides can work with primary aged children.

C. Finally, a series of regional summer workshops was established to assist elementary principals and prime time teachers in the effective use of teacher aides.

II. Richmond Project Outcomes:

A. The major goal of the Richmond Project was ro revise the kindergarten curriculum to include increased individualization of instruction.

B. A second goal was to design a parent guide booklet to explain the new kindergarten curriculum to parents and other interested members of the Richmond Community.

C. A final goal was to develop a video-tape showing children actively participating in the new kindergarten program.

Conclusions

These two cooperative projects forcefully demonstrate ways in which public schools and universities can cooperate in working toward improved educational opportunities for children. It should not be surprising to find that collaborative efforts such as these are both satisfying to the participants in the project and highly beneficial to both collegiate and public school institutions.

Illinois State University

Project Description

The FIPSE Project Staff at Illinois State University worked with two suburban Chicago school systems for its part in the Project--Arlington School District #25 and Elmhurst School District #205. Both are large school systems. Arlington has approximately 6,500 students, 325 faculty and seventeen different buildings. Elmhurst has approximately 10,000 students, 450 faculty and twelve buildings.

Arlington Heights School District #25

The focus of Project activity in Arlington Heights School District #25 was on the role of team leaders among selected teachers at various grade levels, K-8. Outstanding teachers were selected as team leaders and, in addition to regular classroom duties, were given extra responsibilities for curriculum development, instructional program coordination across the same grade levels, and recordkeeping and scheduling functions. Team leaders had responsibility for, but little authority over, those peers with whom they worked.

A planning committee, composed of an ISU Project Staff person and District #25 administrators decided to direct FIPSE Project activities toward a solution to the team leader communication problem. Specific goals for team leaders were focused on interpersonal skills and in working with adults, particularly in ways to motivate adults and manage conflict.

In the planning stage, a series of conflict and communication problems were identified by team leaders and the planning committee. Job-related training sessions were planned to address these specific problems. During the late Spring, 1986, four half-day sessions were held for team leaders. Topics included Small Group Processes, Compliance Gaining/Persuasion, Listening and Responding, and Conflict Management. Resource faculty from the Department of

Communications at Illinois State University were responsible for the conduct of those workshops.

Elmhurst School District #205

Project activities in Elmhurst were organized around the perceived need to improve a mentoring program which was already in place in the district. The Teaching Mentor Program was newly created in 1985-86. In its first year, certain problems arose and many uncertainties existed. As established, outstanding master classroom teachers were identified as mentors and assigned to assist new teachers to the district. Aspiring teachers applied for mentor status and, if selected by the administration, were given a stipend for their work with new teachers. The mentoring process was started just before school in the fall, but most mentoring activities were carried out primarily during the regular academic year. Mentors were still required to assume full teaching responsibilities in the district. Remuneration was made in much the same manner as it was for coaching. Mentor duties included helping new teachers to become acclimated to the district and to their specific assignments, assisting with lesson planning and presentations, providing for staff development activities that were appropriate and developing a true mentoring relationship with their charge during the initial year of teaching.

Six persons from the first years group of mentors were selected to participate in intensive planning involvement and training during the first year of the FIPSE Project. The planning phase of the project involved these six experienced mentors, along with district administrators and an ISU Project Staff member in 1) examination and discussion of pertinent literature on the topic of mentoring, 2) the conceptualization of an orientation program for new mentors in the district, 3) the development of an evaluation program for determining success of project endeavors, and 4) the publishing of a Teaching

Mentor Program Handbook.

During the latter half of the Project year and extending into the summer, the six teachers, administrators and university Project Staff developed the orientation materials, training materials, assessment instruments and the Handbook. In addition, the first years mentors and proteges with which they worked were assessed, using the newly created assessment instruments, data were compiled and analyzed and plans made for startup activities for fall, 1986.

University of Northern Iowa

Project Description

The University of Northern Iowa Teacher of Leadership Development Project identified and focused its year long efforts on two major goals: 1) Provide policy makers with school-based information to make recommendations regarding teacher leadership roles and responsibilities and 2) Explore ways to use existing and develop new leadership models within schools. There were two distinct phases of this project. During the first phase, a teacher and administrator from each of the two school districts joined with the project directors and a representative of the Iowa Department of Public Instruction to form a planning committee. This committee met during the Fall of 1985 semester to study and discuss Master Teacher programs in other states and develop a list of qualifications for participants in the project. The teachers and administrators also identified three specific areas that would become the focus of the second semester's work. Those areas included: improving instructional effectiveness-involving teachers in roles, sharing expertise on instructional delivery or techniques, making classroom observations and aiding others in developing complete teacher repertoires; curriculum development-included the knowledge of the process of development and evaluation, and improvement in

implementation of curriculum; personnel supervision-focused on teachers serving as mentors and evaluators of new faculty and making initial assessments on retaining first year teachers.

The second semester, or second phase of the project, was devoted to developing and testing training materials that would be most effective in providing instruction in the three areas of instructional improvement, curriculum development and personnel.

Planning Phase

The planning committee consisted of representatives from the Department of Public Instruction, one faculty and one administrator from each school district, and the project directors and associate from the University of Northern Iowa. A significant factor in producing the positive outcomes was the involvement of these individuals at the outset of the project and meeting frequently to review progress. This school district, university, and state department collaborative effort was a major strength of the program.

The planning committee began by defining the term master teacher, and modifying the program to satisfy the demands of each school district. Participants felt the term Master Teacher would prompt negative feelings among their co-workers and preferred the title lead teacher, as lead teacher more accurately described what they wanted to accomplish. Therefore, it was an early and wise decision to drop the term master teacher in favor of lead teacher.

Course/Implementation Phase

Course or training stage was offered over the spring semester in nine, half day sessions held on alternate Wednesdays and rotated between two school districts. The agenda consisted of three modules: instructional improvements,

curriculum improvement and personnel. Three meetings each were held for each area of study the planning committee had recommended.

During the two weeks between each meeting, participants carried out field assignments planned by the directors. Assignments included observing other teachers in class for the purpose of self-improvement; engaging in a project which would improve their teaching or leadership in their school; conducting a survey of colleagues, administrators and school board members regarding the role of lead teachers in initiating and developing curriculum change; engaging in a dialogue with a student concerning improving learning performance or attitude and writing a summary of the dialogue and its effects; writing a concept paper describing the circumstances under which a peer supervision process could be approved and implemented within their school system.

The three learning modules; instructional improvement, curriculum development and personnel were designed and implemented by the project staff. The first module, instructional improvement, was developed to assist lead teachers in designing and creating building-wide support groups in which they could share expertise on instructional delivery techniques. Using the coaching concept, teachers could observe each other in the classroom to gain insight for themselves as well as to aid others in targeted areas.

During the curriculum development module, participants weighed the value of creating a curriculum steering committee made up of faculty and administrators. Their field work led them to an investigation of the feasibility of such a committee in their own districts and the role of head teachers in designing, implementing and sustaining curriculum changes or developments.

The final module, personnel, led the participants to an examination of peer supervision in their school systems. Although this module met with more resistance than the previous two, participants concluded that lead teachers are

well suited to observe and supervise peers, especially new or recently transferred teachers.

A crucial factor in the above three learning modules was, how could what was learned and proposed be implemented at low cost in school districts? One district formed a teacher cooperative to provide assistance to faculty members in the area of instructional improvement. They are also involved in the initial stages of developing a curriculum steering committee to coordinate K-12 and subject area curriculum. The other district began exploring ways to develop a teacher mentoring program aimed at improving instruction among new and recently transferred teachers.

The final training session took place in late May on the campus of the University of Northern Iowa. The project directors invited the education community to a morning session, a colloquium by Dr. Ross Nielsen, Head of the Department of Teaching. Dr. Nielsen addressed the issue of appropriate roles for teachers in the 1980s and 1990s. He was followed by Associate Dean of the College of Education, Dr. Marlene Strathe, and Department of Public Instruction Consultant for Teacher Education and Certification, Dr. Merrill Halter. Dean Strathe discussed the nationwide career ladder movement and it's implications for teacher education. Dr. Halter discussed the Master Teachers in terms of the Iowa legislature and it's predicted mandates for future legislative sessions.

Summary/Outcomes

The notion of engaging successful teachers and administrators in the full range planning and delivery of teacher leadership activities was reinforced with the success of this project. The concept, teacher leadership development, requires that leaders from the field be included as full partners in the process. Early inclusion of teachers, administrators and personnel from the Department of Public Instruction guaranteed that findings would be accepted

and, as indicated, incorporated into district goals and objectives.

Important outcomes for this yearlong study include the following: 1) an experimental three-credit course to study lead teacher development was planned, initiated and developed; 2) additional funding from the Department of Public Instruction to continue a follow-up program, including the development of a Teacher Leadership Institute for the spring of 1987; 3) Grundy Center participants plan to form a teacher cooperative in their district to provide assistance to faculty members and will also suggest to their school board the development of a curriculum steering committee; 4) Marshalltown teachers plan to develop and implement a teacher mentoring program aimed at improving instruction; their primary targets will be new or transferred teachers; 5) both districts prepared a summary of the project for presentation to their Board; and 6) Iowa state legislators now have a body of information to draw on when making recommendations regarding career ladder or master teacher programs.

Outcomes and Conclusions

The outcomes of the project came in two forms: 1) process outcomes -- identification and piloting of those elements of collaboration which contributed to successful and beneficial university-school relationships in meeting school needs; and 2) product outcomes -- written documents, tape/slide productions, videotapes, and other materials, emanating from the collaborative efforts of the participating universities and school systems in this project. This project resulted in the following process outcomes :

1. Implementation of planning committee structures and processes which involved university personnel, school system administrators, and teachers establishing the direction, content and delivery of training assistance required by the participating school systems.

2. Delivery of training assistance by universities to school systems which was beyond the mere offering of predetermined source credit hours of content.
3. Delivery of instruction cooperatively planned with school system personnel and featuring problem-centered learning activities (job--embedded and job-related activities and assignments).
4. Delivery of technical assistance (application stage) provided to teacher trainees by university instructors which allowed for the bridging of theory and practice.
5. Formation of a corp of available and competent teaching personnel who can be hired by cooperating universities to participate in preservice and inservice teacher education activities (e.g., supervision of clinical experiences, instructional modeling, and input to curricular and instructional design in higher education teacher education courses.)
6. Change in university policies allowing factors other than credit hours (time for planning, curriculum development and providing technical assistance) to be regarded as part of each university faculty member's workload.
7. Provision of expanded roles/responsibilities for the outstanding teachers of school systems along with training and technical assistance to help those individuals in their new work.
8. Contribution to the improvement of the teaching/learning process of the participating schools by providing skill enhancement for their outstanding teachers.
9. Preparation of teachers with skills and knowledge who are capable for training others within their respective school system (trainer of trainer concept).

The product outcomes included:

1. A draft of a monograph tentatively titled "Exploring a New Form of University-School Collaboration as a Unified Response to Educational Reform"
2. Course syllabus for "Studies in Master Teacher Development" developed and offered at the University of Northern Iowa.
3. "Teaching Mentor Program Handbook" developed by Elmhurst School District #205 and Illinois State University.
4. Evaluation instruments for determining the success and areas for needed improvement in a teaching mentorship program.
5. A new kindergarten curriculum emphasizing academic individualization developed by the Richmond School Corporation with assistance from Ball State University.
6. "A Parent's Guide to Kindergarten" (handbook) developed by the Richmond School Corporation and Ball State University.
7. 20-25 minute videotape "Introducing Our New Kindergarten Program" designed by Richmond School Corporation and Ball State University to help kindergarten parents understand the school system's innovations in curriculum.
8. An observation instrument developed by Anderson School Corporation and Ball State University designed to gather information on how teacher aides (Prime Time aides) use their time in the school setting University.
9. Three tape/slide programs ("Role of Teacher Aides; What Aides Do!" and "How Aides Can Relate to Children") describing the multiple roles of Prime Time aides developed by Anderson School Corporation and Ball State University.

Conclusions

In summary, this project resulted in identifying ways to promote cooperative working relationships between universities and schools in the area of school reform; and in the demonstration of a non-degree form of inservice assistance to schools which provided training for teachers from awareness through the transfer of knowledge/skills to actual job situations. Conclusions which have been reached based on the piloting of the Master Teacher Model Training Program were:

1. A manageable process of university-school collaboration was developed can be emulated by another university;
2. An effective means was recognized for universities and school systems to work together for the improvement in the quality of the curricular and instruction in the elementary and secondary schools;
3. A viable practice was devised for recognizing outstanding members of the teaching profession through enhancement of their skills and knowledge.
4. Successful collaboration was proven when both parties (university and school system) were able to openly discuss, jointly plan, and even negotiate the various parameters of efforts to be undertaken cooperatively.
5. Evidence was provided that true collaboration is greatly promoted if the university can engage faculty time and resources to school systems beyond just credit-generated courses or workshops. Many school districts need assistance that cannot be tied to predetermined course content, course time, assignment responsibilities, and student evaluations.
6. A model of collaboration was found to be successful as a means for university assistance to school systems needing to address various

kinds of programmatic, instructional or organizational needs--not just for working with master teachers and career ladder type plans.

7. The instructional and technical assistance to school systems by universities were found to be most relevant and valuable when such assistance was based on meeting the individualized needs of specific school systems and on real-school problem situations.
8. The professional development of university faculty was enhanced by providing them opportunities to become involved in cooperative working relationships with school practitioners.
9. The model of collaboration piloted gave evidence that this effort was in the right direction for enhancing school improvement activities through the work of educationally prepared master teachers.

Implications

Our experience with this project as an exemplar of a differentiated career model suggests a number of implications.

1. School leadership model - There will need to be enhanced recognition and respect for teacher decision making in educational matters. This will require new models of collaboration between LEA's, SEA's and IHE. An important question is: What will be the new model of school leadership for school principals?
2. Definitions and functioning of the school work environment - The conditions of work for a more professionalized work force will require less isolation, greater specificity of work assignments by teacher strength and credentials (e.g., direct instruction and/or curriculum development, and/or supervision/staff development and so on.) Careful restructuring based on school effectiveness research and stronger and more viable liaison with parents and other supporting professionals will be required. Salaries will have to rise and be layered by career steps based on credentials and not only seniority.
3. Recognition of teacher differences and levels of competence in certification and job definition - The complexity and specialization of teaching will require clear specification of job assignments with articulated duties, areas of responsibility and degree of professional autonomy assumed. Job specifications should follow a clearly articulated career structure line. Not only will the profession have to identify a desirable and functional career structure model but appropriate state policies will have to be developed to support such structures (i.e., certification, program approval, accreditation

standards.)

4. Teacher education curriculum - Most reform efforts call for preparation via the professional school model with the undergraduate degree presumably in arts and sciences. Much work needs to be done not only on improving the amount and quality of the pedagogical component at the graduate level, but also the nature and type of arts and sciences B.A. preparation. This is especially critical at the elementary level. Initial preparation at the graduate level will have clear implications for the present degree structure in higher education. The preparation curriculum should include work which identifies models for professional socialization that incorporates differentiated roles and what duties and prerogatives are associated with differential roles.

Different forms of higher education provided services to schools and their personnel will be required. Greater collaborative working relationships will need to be formulated between university and school faculties in which decisions are mutually arrived at and reflect the needs of practitioners as well as university priorities.

References

Carroll, S. J. (1974). Analysis of the educational personnel system; III. The demand for educational professionals. (R-1308-HEW) Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Chapman, D. W. & Hutcheson, S. M. (1982). Attrition from teaching careers: A discriminant analysis. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 93-105.

Etzioni, A. (Ed;1969). The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers. New York: The Free Press.

Freiberg, H. J. (1985). Master teacher programs: Lessons from the past. Educational Leadership, 42 (4), 16-21.

Freidson, E. (1972). Profession of medicine: A study of the sociology of applied knowledge. New York: Dodd, Mead.

Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1980). Work Redesign. Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Synderman, B. (1959). The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Hold, S. M. Huling, L. L. & Stiegelbauer, S. M. (1983). An analysis of interventions in school improvement efforts. Paper presented at the AERA, Montreal.

Hughes, E. C. (1958). Men and their work. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Lipsitz, J. (1984). Successful school for young adolescents. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books.

Little, J. W., Long, C., & Guildey-Amada, J. (1986). Expanding professional collaboration in schools: Can districts organize leadership by teachers? San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteachers: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Macarov, D. (1982). Worker productivity: Myths and reality. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Oxman, W. G. & Michelli, N. M. (1980). Teacher stress in an urban center: Analysis of a survey of morale among Newark teachers. NIE Report (Contract 400-79-0054).

Schlechty, P. & Vance, V. (1983). Recruitment, selection and retention: The shape of the teaching force. Elementary School Journal, 83 (4), 469-87.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1985). Teacher career ladders: Myths and realities in implementation. Teacher Education and Practice, Spring, 5-13.

Sergiovanni, T. J. & Carver, F. D. (1980). The new school executive: A theory of administration. New York: Harper and Row.

Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group, East Lansing, Mich.: The Holmes Group, (1986).